

ANTON HANDAL (Bar No. 113812)
 anh@handal-law.com
 PAMELA C. CHALK (Bar No. 216411)
 pchalk@handal-law.com
 GABRIEL HEDRICK (Bar No. 220649)
 ghedrick@handal-law.com
 HANDAL & ASSOCIATES
 1200 Third Avenue, Suite 1321
 San Diego, California 92101
 Tel: 619.544.6400
 Fax: 619.696.0323

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant
 e.Digital Corporation

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

e.Digital Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

Fusion-io, Inc.,

Defendant.

And Related Counterclaims.

Case No. 3:13-cv-2901-H-BGS

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
 FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

**Assigned to the Honorable
 Judge Marilyn L. Huff**

Courtroom 15A (Annex)

Plaintiff e.Digital Corporation (“e.Digital” or “Plaintiff”), by and through its undersigned counsel, complains and alleges against Defendant Fusion-io, Inc., (“Fusion-io” or “Defendant”) as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a civil action for infringement of a patent arising under the laws of the United States relating to patents, 35 U.S.C. § 101, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281. Plaintiff e.Digital seeks a preliminary and permanent injunction and monetary damages for the infringement of its U.S. Patent No. 5,839,108.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case for patent infringement under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) and pursuant to the patent laws of the United States of America, 35 U.S.C. § 101, *et seq.*

3. Venue properly lies within the Southern District of California pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (c), and (d) and 1400(b). On information and belief, Defendant conducts substantial business directly and/or through third parties or agents in this judicial district by selling and/or offering to sell the infringing products and/or by conducting other business in this judicial district. Furthermore, Plaintiff e.Digital is headquartered and has its principal place of business in this district, engages in business in this district, and has been harmed by Defendant's conduct, business transactions and sales in this district.

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because, on information and belief, Defendant transacts continuous and systematic business within the State of California and the Southern District of California. In addition, this Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant because, on information and belief, this lawsuit arises out of Defendant's infringing activities, including, without limitation, the making, using, selling and/or offering to sell infringing products in the State of California and the Southern District of California. Finally, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because, on information and belief, Defendant has made, used, sold and/or offered for sale its infringing products and placed such infringing products in the stream of interstate commerce with the expectation that such infringing products would be made, used, sold and/or offered for sale within the State of California and the Southern District of California.

5. Upon information and belief, certain of the products manufactured by Defendant have been and/or are currently sold to consumers including, but not limited to, consumers located within the State of California and/or offered for sale

1 at, among other places, through the Fusion-io 1-800 sales number located at
 2 800.578.6007 and/or through the Fusion-io Silicon Valley office, located at 2880
 3 Junction Avenue, San Jose, CA 95134-1922.

4 **PARTIES**

5 6. Plaintiff e.Digital is a Delaware corporation with its headquarters and
 6 principal place of business at 16870 West Bernardo Drive, Suite 120, San Diego,
 7 California 92127.

8 7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Fusion-io, Inc. is a
 9 corporation registered and lawfully existing under the laws of the State of
 10 Delaware, with an office and principal place of business located at 2855 E.
 11 Cottonwood Parkway Suite 100, Salt Lake City, UT 84121.

12 **THE ASSERTED PATENT**

13 8. On November 17, 1998, the United States Patent and Trademark
 14 Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,839,108 (“the ’108
 15 patent”) entitled “Flash Memory File System In A Handheld Record And Playback
 16 Device,” to its named inventors Norbert P. Daberko and Richard K. Davis.
 17 Plaintiff e.Digital is the assignee and owner of the entire right, title and interest in
 18 and to the ’108 patent and has the right to bring this suit for damages and other
 19 relief. A true and correct copy of the ’108 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

20 **COUNT ONE**

21 **INFRINGEMENT OF THE ’108 PATENT BY DEFENDANT**

22 9. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the
 23 allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 8 above.

24 10. The accused products include but are not limited to Fusion-io’s Flash
 25 Memory Storage products including but not limited to its USB, SSD, SD,
 26 microSD, and/or Compact Flash products. The primary and substantial purpose of
 27 the accused products is to write to and store data in electronic format in non-
 28 volatile flash memory.

1 11. Fusion-io has directly and indirectly infringed and is directly and
2 indirectly infringing Claim 1 of the '108 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, *et*
3 *seq.*, by making, using, offering for sale, selling in the United States and/or
4 importing into the United States without authority, the accused products identified
5 above. Claim 1 of the '108 patent teaches a method of memory management for a
6 non-volatile storage medium. In general, the method comprises several steps,
7 which generally involves, without limitation, writing electronic data segments from
8 volatile, temporary memory to a non-volatile, long-term storage medium by
9 linking data segments according to a number of specified steps.

10 12. Plaintiff alleges that at least as of the date of the filing of the
11 originally filed complaint in this matter, if not sooner, Fusion-io knew or should
12 have known of the existence of Claim 1 of the '108 patent and the fact that the
13 accused products infringe said Claim 1.

14 13. Plaintiff alleges that Fusion-io sold, sells, offers to sell, ships, or
15 otherwise delivers the accused products to customers or end-users with all the
16 features required to infringe Claim 1 of the '108 patent. Upon information and
17 belief, Fusion-io knows that the accused products infringe Claim 1 of the '108
18 patent and intends to induce third parties to include its customers and end-users to
19 also infringe Claim 1 of the '108 patent.

20 14. Upon information and belief, the accused products, alone or in
21 combination with other products, directly or, alternatively, under the doctrine of
22 equivalents practice each of the limitations of independent Claim 1 of the '108
23 patent when they are used for their normal and intended purpose of writing to and
24 storing electronic data on non-volatile memory. Thus, Fusion-io directly infringes
25 Claim 1 of the '108 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) when it demonstrates,
26 tests or otherwise uses the accused products in the United States.

27

28

1 15. By way of example, Fusion-io's demonstration and/or how-to videos,
 2 posted by Fusion-io, show Fusion-io and/or its authorized agents or employees¹
 3 explaining its proprietary file management systems that utilizes cache memory and
 4 organizes data physically and virtually in ways that Plaintiff asserts utilizes the
 5 elements of Claim 1 of the '108 patent. In addition, Plaintiff asserts that the
 6 accused products utilize a Fusion-io proprietary "Virtual Storage Layer" that
 7 practices the elements of the Claim 1 of the '108 patent as described in its product
 8 literature entitled "ioMemory Virtual Storage Layer (VSL)". At least since the
 9 date of the filing of the original complaint, Fusion-io's continued manufacture, use
 10 and sale of the accused products constitute acts of direct infringement of Claim 1
 11 of the '108 patent.

12 16. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that Fusion-io uses, makes,
 13 sells, offers to sell and/or imports the accused products knowing that they will be
 14 used by its customers and end-users for writing and storing electronic data to non-
 15 volatile memory utilizing the steps described in Claim 1 of the '108 patent.
 16 Fusion-io's product literature, materials and instructional videos advertise and
 17 encourage customers to use the accused product(s) to store electronic data in the
 18 accused products, which utilize the methods of memory management taught by
 19 Claim 1 of the '108 patent and in a manner it knows infringes Claim 1 of the '108
 20 patent.

21 17. In addition to what is described above, Plaintiff asserts that Fusion-io
 22 provides operating manuals and/or quick-start guides, user or installation guides,
 23 instructional/informational "how-to" videos, answers to questions on its FAQs
 24 page of its website, webinars, and blogs on its website and/or on other public

25 _____
 26 ¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gLZyh3J7dXA&list=PLYp8b4bSLEiqyQBiGFBkHv80ogIfUZn4>
 27

1 websites that instruct customers and end-users on how to connect the accused
 2 products and use them as non-volatile storage devices for electronic data. Among
 3 other things, Fusion-io's informational materials lay out step-by-step instructions
 4 on how to utilize the features of the accused products to write data into the memory
 5 of the accused products – a process that utilizes the method disclosed in Claim 1 of
 6 the '108 patent and which Fusion-io knows (at the least as of the filing of the
 7 original complaint if not sooner) infringes the method taught in Claim 1 of the '108
 8 patent. Plaintiff believes that Fusion-io directs consumers and end-users to consult
 9 and utilize such instructional videos and other informational material.

10 18. In addition to the information described above, Plaintiff believes and
 11 thereupon alleges that Fusion-io is aware that its customers and end-users are using
 12 the accused products in an infringing manner based on, among other things: 1) the
 13 discussions, questions, answers, and/or comments posted on its Facebook and/or
 14 Twitter website pages where Fusion-io's authorized agents, customers and/or end-
 15 users discuss and disclose the use of the accused products for non-volatile
 16 electronic data storage, a process which Fusion-io knows infringes upon Claim 1 of
 17 the '108 patent; 2) the case studies posted on Fusion-io's website that show
 18 Fusion-io's customers and end-users discussing and disclosing the use of the
 19 accused products for non-volatile electronic data storage, a process which Fusion-
 20 io knows infringes upon Claim 1 of the '108 patent; and/or, 3) the fact that Fusion-
 21 io encourages its customers and end-users to use the accused products in an
 22 infringing manner as set forth in the preceding Paragraphs.

23 19. As alleged above, incorporated herewith, and based upon information
 24 and belief, Plaintiff further alleges that since at least from the date of the filing of
 25 the original complaint, Fusion-io, has without authority induced and continues to
 26 induce infringement of the '108 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) inasmuch
 27 as:

28 a. The accused products infringe Claim 1 during their normal use by

1 Fusion-io's customers and/or end-users;

2 b. Fusion-io has known and has been continuously aware of the '108
3 patent since at least the filing of the original complaint in this
4 action, if not sooner;

5 c. Fusion-io has acted in a manner that encourages and continues to
6 encourage others to infringe Claim 1 of the '108 patent by, among
7 other things, intentionally instructing and/or encouraging
8 customers and end-users to use the accused products in a manner
9 that Fusion-io knows or should have known would cause them to
10 infringe the '108 patent;

11 d. Fusion-io sells, distributes, and supplies the accused products to
12 customers and end-users with the intent that the products be used
13 in an infringing manner;

14 e. Fusion-io provides operating manuals, installation guides,
15 instructional videos, webcasts, or other instructional material
16 designed to instruct customers and end-users to use the products
17 in an infringing manner; and,

18 f. Fusion-io advertises, markets, and promotes the use of the
19 accused products in an infringing manner.

20 20. As alleged above, incorporated herewith, and based upon information
21 and belief, Plaintiff alleges that since at least from the date of the filing of the
22 original complaint, Fusion-io has contributed and continues to contribute to the
23 infringement of Claim 1 of the '108 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c)
24 inasmuch as:

25 a. The accused products infringe Claim 1 of the '108 patent during
26 the normal use of the accused products by Fusion-io's customers
27 and/or end-users;

28 b. Fusion-io has known and has been continuously aware of the '108

1 patent since at least the filing of the original complaint in this
2 action, if not sooner;

3 c. Fusion-io imports into the United States, sells and/or offers to sell
4 within the United States products that (a) practice the method of
5 memory management of Claim 1 of the '108 patent; and, (b)
6 Fusion-io knows that the same constitute material infringing
7 component(s) of the accused products, which were made and/or
8 especially adapted for use in the accused products;

9 d. The memory management component(s) and methods of the
10 accused products are not staple articles of commerce suitable for
11 substantial non-infringing use with respect to the '108 patent; and,

12 e. Fusion-io sells, has sold, and/or has supplied the accused products
13 knowing of Plaintiff's '108 patent and knowing that the accused
14 products incorporate Plaintiff's patented method and/or were
15 specially adapted for use in a way which infringes the '108 patent.

16 21. As alleged above, Plaintiff alleges that Fusion-io had notice of the
17 '108 patent and knowledge of infringement of Claim 1 of the '108 patent since at
18 least the filing of the original complaint in this matter, if not sooner. Fusion-io has
19 and continues to sell products that practice the '108 patent after acquiring
20 knowledge of infringement.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment as follows:

23 1. That Defendant be declared to have infringed the Patent-in-Suit;

24 2. That Defendant, Defendant's officers, agents, servants, employees,
25 and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with them, be
26 preliminarily and permanently enjoined from infringement of the Patent-in-Suit,
27 including but not limited to any making, using, offering for sale, selling, or
28 importing of unlicensed infringing products within and without the United States;

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

HANDAL & ASSOCIATES

Dated: May 8, 2014

By: /s/Pamela C. Chalk
Anton N. Handal
Pamela C. Chalk
Gabriel G. Hedrick
Attorneys for Plaintiff
And Counter-Defendant
e.Digital Corporation

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

3 The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the
4 foregoing document has been served on this date to all counsel of record, if any to
5 date, who are deemed to have consented to electronic service via the Court's
6 CM/ECF system per CivLR 5.4(d). Any other counsel of record will be served by
7 electronic mail, facsimile and/or overnight delivery upon their appearance in this
8 matter.

9 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the
10 foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 8th day of May, 2014 at San Diego,
11 California.

12
13 **HANDAL & ASSOCIATES**

14 Dated: May 8, 2014

By: /s/Pamela C. Chalk
Anton N. Handal
Pamela C. Chalk
Gabriel G. Hedrick
Attorneys for Plaintiff
And Counter-Defendant
e.Digital Corporation